

mucous, sense of weight of bladder, passage of small red gravel and grit, sudden stoppage while passing water, pain and ache in back, side, and hips, running down to the urinary organs, and frequency of urination, and that the Tarina carbolized salve was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for croup, ulcerated sore throat, salt rheum, scald head, tetter, eczema, crusta lacta or scalp disease, granulated (or sore) eyelids, sore and inflamed lungs, bleeding, itching, blind, and outward piles, obstinate and running sores, old sores, all skin diseases, blotches, scales, pimples, eruptions, catarrh with sores, ulcers, offensive discharge, earache, whooping cough, and mumps, and effective to prevent scars after scalds and burns, when, in truth and in fact, they were not.

On March 16, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**9749. Misbranding of Allan's Star Brand pills and compound tansy, pennyroyal, and cotton root pills. U. S. \* \* \* v. 6 Boxes \* \* \* of Allan's Star Brand Pills and 4 Packages \* \* \* of Compound Tansy, Pennyroyal, and Cotton Root Pills. Default decrees finding products to be misbranded and ordering their destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 13487, 13590. I. S. Nos. 266-t, 267-t. S. Nos. C-2383, C-2456.)**

On August 25 and September 8, 1920, respectively, the United States attorney for the Western District of Arkansas, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 6 boxes, more or less, of Allan's Star Brand pills and 4 packages, more or less, of compound tansy, pennyroyal, and cotton root pills, at Fort Smith, Ark., alleging that the articles had been shipped by the Allan-Pfeiffer Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo., on or about May 20, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Arkansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Star Brand pills consisted essentially of iron sulphate, aloes, and starch, and that the tansy, pennyroyal, and cotton root pills consisted essentially of iron sulphate, oil of pennyroyal, and aloes.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the following statements regarding their therapeutic and curative effects, appearing in the circulars inclosed in each box containing the respective articles, (Allan's Star Brand pills) "Allan's Star Brand Pills A Good Remedy In Suppressed or Painful Menstruation. \* \* \* to bring on the menses \* \* \* immediately preceding the expected appearance of the menstrual flow active treatment should begin. \* \* \* Take one Pill \* \* \* Continue this treatment \* \* \* until satisfactory result is secured. To Prevent Irregularities—Take one Pill \* \* \* four or five days preceding the expected appearance of the menstrual period. For Painful Menstruation—The same treatment prescribed for suppression," (compound tansy, pennyroyal, and cotton root pills) "\* \* \* A Safe and Effectual Remedy in Suppressed or Painful Menstruation. \* \* \* Four or five days immediately preceding the expected appearance of the menstrual flow active treatment should begin. Take one Pill \* \* \* To Prevent Irregularities.—Take one Pill three times daily for four or five days preceding the expected appearance of the menstrual period. For Painful Menstruation.—The same treatment prescribed for suppression," were false and fraudulent in that the said articles did not contain any substances or mixture of substances capable of producing the results claimed.

On August 11, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of the court were entered finding the products to be misbranded and ordering their destruction by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**9750. Misbranding of Pratt's cholera remedy, poultry regulator, animal regulator, and hog cholera specific. U. S. \* \* \* v. Pratt Food Co., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 10896. I. S. Nos. 4870-p, 4874-p, 4875-p, 6811-p.)**

On November 24, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Pratt Food Co., a corporation, Philadelphia, Pa., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Florida, on or about December 12, 1917, of a quantity of Pratt's cholera remedy, and on or about March 16, 1918, of quantities of Pratt's poultry regulator and Pratt's animal regulator, respectively, and from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of North Carolina, on or about December 11, 1917, of a quantity of Pratt's hog cholera specific, all of which were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Pratt's cholera remedy consisted essentially of iron sulphate, aluminum sulphate, and ginger; that the Pratt's poultry regulator consisted essentially of fenugreek seed, ginger, fennel, gentian, nux vomica, charcoal, sulphur, calcium carbonate, and iron sulphate; that the Pratt's animal regulator consisted essentially of fenugreek seed, ginger, fennel, gentian, nux vomica, charcoal, salt, and iron sulphate; and that the Pratt's hog cholera specific consisted essentially of fenugreek seed, gentian, charcoal, salt, sulphur, and a small amount of ferrous sulphate.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof, appearing on the labels of the packages containing the respective articles, falsely and fraudulently represented that the Pratt's cholera remedy was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for chicken cholera; that the Pratt's poultry regulator was effective to prevent chicken cholera, roup, gapes, and all common ailments of poultry and as a treatment, remedy, and cure for chicken cholera, roup, gapes, and all common ailments of poultry; that the Pratt's animal regulator was effective to prevent hog cholera and as a treatment for hog cholera; and that the Pratt's hog cholera specific was effective to prevent hog cholera and as a treatment, remedy, and cure for hog cholera, when, in fact and in truth, they were not.

On June 15, 1921, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*